Development Board had submitted a recommendation to the Government to enact a law to prohibit the slaughter of cows and bulls in the state. The subject was discussed at one of the sessions of the Legislative Council and also in the Press and on the platform which reflected the opinion of the public. The Member proceeded to argue his point on humanitarian grounds and quoted Regulation IV of 1079 and Regulation XII of 1089 as instances in which the Government had taken such action. The State of Kashmir was cited and the Member pointed out that it was the bounden duty of a Hindu State to intervene and stop the slaughter of cows. He then pleaded for more grazing lands as another measure for the protection and better breeding of cows, as it was generally the underfed cow that was being slaughtered. In conclusion, he requested that a law be enacted prohibiting the slaughter of cows at an early date or, in the alternative, to appoint a committee to report to the Government about the present condition of bovine animals in the State, and the feasibility of enacting a law in the interests of public health and the promotion of agriculture.

22. Immediate prohibition of cow slaughter.

Mr. Parameswaran Narayanan Bhattatiri (Member, Jenmi, Quilon Division) said that he did not want to waste the time of the Assembly by repeating the arguments advanced by the previous Member. He advocated the immediate prohibition of cow slaughter, firstly because this State was being ruled by a Hindu Ruler, secondly, on humanitarian grounds, thirdly on grounds of public health, and lastly in the interests of agriculture.

The Member presented a memorial on the subject signed by 23 members of the Assembly.

President's reply.—As regards the prohibition of cow-slaughter, I may state that a resolution on the subject was moved in the Legislative Council recently and that it was lost. The request of Mr. Sivaramakrishna Aiyar for the appointment of a committee to go into the question and the other suggestions contained in his speech and that of Mr. Parameswaran Narayanan Bhattatiri are noted.

23. The Ezhava Bill.

Mr. K. Padmanabhan Vaidyan (Member, Nominated) referred to the sad and premature death of Mr. N. Kumaran Asan, who for several years was a useful member of the Assembly, and expressed the gratitude of the community for the valuable services Mr. Asan had rendered on their behalf.

The Member next stated that the Ezhava Bill in its present form was highly detrimental to the interests of the *Misradaya* section of Ezhavas. The Member traced the history of the Bill and said that it owed its birth to the representations made at successive sessions of the Assembly by Ezhava Members. He then explained how the Ezhava Law Committee was appointed, how the examination of witnesses was proceeded with, in spite of protests, and how the final form assumed by the Bill was extremly one-sided. Coming to the later stages of the Bill, the Member said that, when it was being read for a second time in the Legislative Council, the inhabitants of Chirayinkil, Neyyattinkara, Nedumangad, Trivandrum, Quilon and Kottarakara waited on the Dewan and represented their grievances. They were then told that their grievances would be looked into. Since then the nature of the passage of the Bill through the Council was such that they were afraid of the danger ahead and had resolved to submit their grievances once again. The masses of the population among them were not educated enough to gauge the merits and demerits of the Bill. Though it was alleged that the Bill contained provisions which were in the best interests of the community, such a view was not upheld by those whom he represented. The law of inheritance and succession among *Misradayees* had been frequently laid down by the High Court and those decisions had won the approval of the community. The Government and the Legislative Council should give their recognition to those recorded pronouncements of the High Court. Nothing contrary to such pronouncements should be attempted so far as the *Misradayees* were concerned. The Member then proceeded to consider the Ezhava Bill in detail and entered his strong protest against section 31 of the Bill. He submitted that the amendment in that respect did not satisfy his section of the community and that they had therefore asked him to once again submit their well-considered views.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

in order that the Government might bestow careful thought and save them from the evils arising from the present Bill. The provisions in Part V relating to self-acquisitions were not approved by them. They were not for willing away the whole of their acquisitions to their children, but only one-half. Again, individual partition recognised in Chapter VII was not to their liking. He then discussed the amendment to section 31 recently passed by the Council and the evils arising therefrom to the *Misradayees*. What the authors of the Bill wanted—whether individual or *thavazhee* partition—was not clear. *Thavazhee* partition had been the guiding principle among the *Misradayees* and it was that system of inheritance that they wished to have. The Member also objected to the clause laying down that in cases of intestate succession the whole of the self-acquision of the person dying intestate should go to his wife and children. The partition sections in Chapter VII were contradictory to one another. It could not be said that the discussion of the Bill in the Legislative Council was entirely barren of benefit to them. Section 33 conferred on them some benefit, but it was rendered useless by the addendum that the majority in a family could nullify its effect. In effect the *Misradayees* had been reduced to a position in which they had no credit in the land. The Member then referred to the noble and self-sacrificing labours of Mr. P. Parameswaran in the Council to exempt all *Misradayees* from the operation of the Bill. But they fell flat on the Council. He was confident that not even 5 per cent. of the *Misradayees* would accept the Bill. The general sense of the community was that they wanted relief even from the latest amendment of that Section introduced by the Law Member. The Bill placed the *Misradayees* under a religious disability in respect of death, pollution, *sraddha*, etc., and on that account also the *Misradayees* should be totally exempted from the Bill. It was not too late even now to comply with their request. Although the Bill was awaiting final reading, he believed that the Government had power to interfere even at that stage and save an important section of the community from the danger which would befall them if the Bill in its present form was to become law. In conclusion, the Member prayed that section 33 might be so amended as to exempt all *Misradayees* from the provisions of the Ezhava Bill.

President's reply.—I understand your difficulties. The Bill has been read a second time in the Legislative Council. The final reading is not over, and as such no definite reply can be given now. If, after the Bill is passed into law, the members of your section of the community require any exemption from its operation, they may apply to the authorities within six months from the date of the enactment as laid down therein.

24. Need for a law governing the right of succession, etc., among Malayala Brahmins.

Mr. Trivikraman Vasudevan (Member, Jenmi, Trivandrum Division) represented that there was no recognised law of succession among Malayala Brahmins and that what they had at present was neither Makkathayam nor Marumakkathayam. A resolution on the subject of the enactment of a law of succession for them was passed at the annual session of the Yogakshema Sabha and sent to the Governments in Travancore, Cochin and British Malabar some time ago. It was also the sense of the community that marriages among them should be endogamous. But the practical difficulty in bringing about that reform was the inability of the men to support their family due to the system of inheritance which now prevails. Junior members of Malayala Brahmin families should have at least the right to claim partition. As in such an important matter it was highly necessary that the general consensus of opinion in the community should be correctly gauged, the Member urged the appointment of a committee of enquiry for that purpose and requested that a Bill might be drafted by that committee.

President's reply.—This being a piece of social legislation, a private Bill may be introduced in the Council. The question of the appointment of a committee to enquire into the manners and customs obtaining among Malayala Brahmins as regards marriage, inheritance, etc., will be considered by the Government.

25. Enactment of a law relating to "wakfs" among Mahomedans.

Mr. Sayyid Mahomed Kannu (Member, Nominated) said that his representation related solely to the administration of *wakf* property. He said that, according to

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly